	Case 5:10-cv-04166-JF Doo	cument 13 Filed 05/10/11 Page 1 of 3	
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9	NOT FOR CITATION		
10	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12	CLAUD M. THOMAS, JR.,) No. C 10-04166 JF (PR)	
13	Plaintiff,)) ORDER OF DISMISSAL	
14	vs.		
15)	
16	PRISON HEALTH SERVICES, et al.,		
17	Defendants.) (Docket No. 12)	
18			
19	Plaintiff, an inmate currently incarcerated at the Santa Rita Jail in Dublin,		
20	California, filed the instant civil rights action in <u>pro se</u> pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983		
21	against jail officials for constitutionally deficient medical care. Finding the complaint,		
22	liberally construed, stated cognizable claims, the Court ordered service upon Defendants		
23	on February 23, 2011. (Docket No. 4.)		
24	On February 28, 2011, the copy of the order of service mailed to Plaintiff was		
25	returned by mail to the Clerk of the Court as undeliverable because Plaintiff was no		
26	longer in custody. (Docket No. 5.) As of the date of this order, Plaintiff has not updated		
27	his address with the Court or submitted any further pleadings in this case. Defendants		
28	have filed a motion to dismiss for failure to prosecute under Federal Rule of Civil		
	Order of Dismissal P:\PRO-SE\SJ.JF\CR.10\Thomas04166_dism3-11.wpd	1	
	<u> </u>		

Procedure 41(b). (Docket No. 12.) Defendants argue that the Court had advised Plaintiff of his responsibility to notify the Court of a change of address in its Order of Service or be subject to dismissal under Rule 41(b). (Docket No. 12.) The Court will deny the motion as Plaintiff never received a copy of the Order of Service, which was returned as undeliverable. See *supra* at 1.

However, the complaint is subject to dismissal under Northern District Local Rule 3-11, which requires a party proceeding <u>pro se</u> to promptly file a notice of change of address while an action is pending. <u>See L.R. 3-11(a)</u>. The Court may, without prejudice, dismiss a complaint when: (1) mail directed to the <u>pro se</u> party by the Court has been returned to the Court as not deliverable, and (2) the Court fails to receive within sixty days of this return a written communication from the <u>pro se</u> party indicating a current address. <u>See L.R. 3-11(b)</u>.

More than sixty days have passed since the Court's order addressed to Plaintiff was returned as undeliverable. The Court has not received a notice from Plaintiff of a new address. Accordingly, the instant civil rights action is DISMISSED without prejudice pursuant to Rule 3-11 of the Northern District Local Rules.

This order terminates Docket No. 12.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: _____

JEREMY FOGEL
United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CLAUD M. THOMAS, JR,	Case Number: CV10-04166 JF	
Plaintiff,	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
v.		
PRISON HEALTH SERVICES, et al.,		
Defendants.	/	
I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I at Court, Northern District of California.	m an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District	
attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a p	_, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the ostage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) elope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into d in the Clerk's office.	
Claud M. Thomas AQI-083 Santa Rita Jail 5325 Broder Blvd Dublin, CA 94568		
Dated:		
	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk	